

Date: Mon, 3 Jan 94 15:03:49 PST
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V93 #1539
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest Mon, 3 Jan 94 Volume 93 : Issue 1539

Today's Topics:

ASAPS & IONCAP
Bad Ham Company (2 msgs)
Disability Waivers for CW scam
GST update for 1994 tracking
Looking for information
MFJ vertical
QST, JAN.94 P.9 "IT SEEMS TO US ..." K1ZZ COLUMN
TOYOTAS AND MOBILE RIGS
Where to Start?

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Mon, 3 Jan 1994 18:54:35 GMT
From: netcomsv!netcom.com!rbloom@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: ASAPS & IONCAP
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

any opinions on these HF propagation codes?
one is austrailian and the other american -- government-lab-developed.

are they worth \$300.00? and if so: to whom?

rb.
WA6MQC

Date: 3 Jan 1994 18:05:53 GMT

From: haven.umd.edu!darwin.sura.net!paladin.american.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!
sol.ctr.columbia.edu!caen!malgudi.oar.net!news.ysu.edu!yfn.ysu.edu!ag821@ames.arpa

Subject: Bad Ham Company

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Boy am I upset.. had my first bad experience with a ham company.

I purchased the Cmos superkeyer II from R&R associates. Had it working and then put it away. took it out about 3 weeks later for a contest. The keyer went crazy. I checked the circuit.. nothing wrong.. finally got the chip out of my Idiom Press version and stuck it in the circuit..worked fine.. seemed it was definetly the chip.

Wrote a long letter and sent the chip back to R&R. Dick had chip for a long time. .got it back today.. he told me to send it back to Bud Southard.. no address or anything.. told me to check for a bad soldering joint.. also gave me the address of Innovative Electronics and told me to deal with them .. because that is where he gets the chips from..

I bought the kit from R&R.. think they should have done something.

Anyone have a phone # for R&R or know who Bud Southard is.

I think this Dick, is definelty a real

Jeff, AC4HF

--

Jeff M. Gold, AC4HF

Manager, Academic Computing Support

Tennessee Technological University

Date: 3 Jan 94 20:27:14 GMT

From: ogicse!uwm.edu!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!sdd.hp.com!hpscit.sc.hp.com!
cupnews0.cup.hp.com!jholly@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: Bad Ham Company

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Jeff Gold (ag821@yfn.ysu.edu) wrote:

[stuff about bad keyer deleted]

: Wrote a long letter and sent the chip back to R&R. Dick had chip for a
: long time. .got it back today.. he told me to send it back to Bud
: Southard.. no address or anything.. told me to check for a bad soldering

: joint.. also gave me the address of Innovative Electronics and told me
: to deal with them .. because that is where he gets the chips from..
:
: I bought the kit from R&R.. think they should have done something.
:

It seems that Bud Southard is the contact at Innovative Electronics and
Bud deals with the problems with bad chips...Did you try to contact
Innovative Electronics?

What more would want R&R do for you? You feel that you may have isolated the
problem with the kit. But then from the description of the problem it does
seem likely you may have a bad solder joint. About the only other thing that
crosses my mind is that R&R could have sent you a new chip. Are you sure you
got your original chip back? Maybe R&R can't get returns from Innovative
and that is why Dick suggested you contact Innovative.

The days of Heathkit are only enjoyed in the history books. From what I
have read about Ramsey on the net, you seem to have had the luck of getting
you project working.

73, Jim, WA6SDM

Date: 3 Jan 94 19:48:50 GMT
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!srngenprp!
alanb@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Disability Waivers for CW scam
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

William J Turner (wjturner@iastate.edu) wrote:

: That's all they need? A "severe handicap"?
: Anybody seen anyone with a CW waiver because they are paralyzed from the waist
: down? Maybe I should be the first and use it for my 20wpm...
: <HI> <HI>

Darn, all that studying CW for nothing. (Does paralyzed from the neck up
count?)

AL N1AL :=)

Date: 3 Jan 94 21:59:50 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu

Subject: GST update for 1994 tracking
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

For all of you still tracking satellites with a BASIC program:

Here is Greenwich Sidereal Time (GST) for January 0, 1994

G2 = 0.2761908

You will need to replace this value in your program for element sets with Epoch 1994 and later. Don't forget that you can just use a date of 13/01/93, 13/02/93, ... until you get 1994 element sets.

73 & Happy New Year
Dick, N3FKV

Date: 3 Jan 94 18:36:32 GMT
From: ogicse!cs.uoregon.edu!sgiblab!swrinde!emory!emoryu1!osakb@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Looking for information
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

jangus@skyld.tele.com (Jeffrey D. Angus) writes:

:
: Doesn't anyone read books any more?
: Doesn't anyone go the the library and look for something themselves?
: Doesn't anyone look in technical publications for information?
:
Jeff, you're absolutely right. But, this problem doesn't seem to be exclusive to ham radio. In my work as a computer technical support person, I've noticed that very few people, regardless of their level of formal education, are willing to look anything up.

Personally, I think it's an extension of the fact that many people simply do not understand cause and effect relationships in general. Once someone has decided that he does not want to understand how and why things work, it's an easy step to seek only the quickest solution to an immediate problem without regard to solving future problems. In many ways, this short term view of the world may be part of the explanation for how the world reached its present condition.

Bert Bruner
osakb@unix.cc.emory.edu
KE4FOV

From: ogicse!cs.uoregon.edu!sgiblab!pacbell.com!att-out!cbnewsj!
k2ph@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: TOYOTAS AND MOBILE RIGS
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Date: 3 Jan 94 20:46:01 GMT
From: vnet.IBM.COM@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Where to Start?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In <tony.blake.17.2D287BDF@stpaul.ncr.com> Tony C Blake writes:
>I am looking for those satellite operators who would like to recommend
>radio/antenna combinations for working the satellites.

The 1994 Buyer's Guide issue of CQ Magazine has an article you might
want to check out for beginning in satellite use.

73, Evan N2XJK

Date: (null)
From: (null)
PART ONE (1):
INSTANT LICENSING

Every radio amateur has had to endure a period of anxious , watchful waiting aft
er taking an examination .
ter taking an examination. just as the watched pot never boils, the watched
mailbox never disgorges the desired news from gettysburg. when WILL that
license finally arrive? for a new enthusiast it can never be soon enough.

Last summer, licensing delays got pretty bad. for awhile it was taking three
months or more from the time an exam was passed untill the license hit the
mailbox [although at this writing, the turnaround time is down to about six
weeks]. No one thinks such long delays are acceptable.

Heres how the process works. Typically, local teams of the volunteer
examiners return the exam results to the volunteer examiner coordinator [vec]
in just a couple of days. The vec's are obligated to turn the sessions
around in 10 days, and usually take a lot less time than that. The ARRL/VEC
then uses overnight delivery to get the session results to the FCC's processors
in gettysburg. There ,work tends to back up because of limited staff and an
obsolete computer system.

Delay begets delay. when the licenses dont cone after a resonable time, applicants want to make sure their paperwork hasn't been lost, or held up because they filled something out wrong. So, they get on the phone th the VEC and the FCC. you can't blame them for wanting to know, but this pulls people away from processing and adds even further to the backlog.

There has to be a better way.

In November , the fcc proposed what it apparently thought was a better way. The scheme ,as outlined in a Notice of Proposed Rule Making in PR Docket93-267, is to grant temporary operating authority for up to 120 days t o anyone who has earned a Certificate of Successful Completion of Examination [CSCE] by passing the examination elements required for a license. Those with a history of non compliance with FCC Amateur Radio Service rules would be ineligible, and the temporary authorary could be modified or cancelled at any time.

The timing of the Commission's proposal was a bit curious, because the problem already was being addressed in another way . In October 1992, in Public Law 102-538, Congress authorized the FCC to implement electronic filing of applications by allowing them to be signed "in any manner or form including by electronic means, as the Commission may prscribe by regulation." In April 1993, the Fcc adopted the necessary amendments to its Private Radio Service rules; at the time it noted that the amateur rules, Part97, required no amendment because there are no specific provisions regarding signatures in Part 97.

Now,more than a year after Congress acted, new eletronic filing procedures still remain to be implemented . At the time the Commission said, "Electronic filing will expedite the licensing process by eliminating the need for manual entry of application data into the Commission's data base .

PLEASE LOOK FOR THE SECOND PART OF THIS MESSAGE . TNXS
SUBJECT: QST, JAN.94, P9 "IT SEEMS TO US...." K1ZZ COLUMN.

PART TWO (2).

INSTANT LICENSING:

THE ARRL AND OTHER VECs HAVE EMPHASIZED A WILLINGNESS TO SUBMIT APPLICATIONS ELECTRONICALLY, THUS ELIMINATING THE DELAYS AT GETTYSBURG THAT RESULT FROM EVERYTHING HAVING TO WAIT TO BE ENTERED MANUALLY. OUR BUDGET PLANNING INCLUDES ADEQUATE PROVISIONS FOR IMPLEMENTING ELECTRONIC FILING AS SOON AS THE FCC GIVES US THE GO-AHEAD. COUPLED WITH A NEW COMPUTER SYSTEM THE COMMISSION IS ALREADY WORKING ON, THIS SHOULD RESULT IN TYPICAL TURN-AROUND TIMES DROPPING TO JUST A COUPLE OF WEEKS - A DRAMATIC IMPROVEMENT OVER PAST AND PRESENT PERFORMANCE.

JUDGING FROM THE COMMENTS WE'RE HEARING, THE AMATEUR COMMUNITY THINKS THIS WOULD BE SUFFICIENT AND IS UNPERSUADED THAT THE ADDITIONAL ADVANTAGES TO BE GAINED FROM "INSTANT LICENSING" OUTWEIGH THE RISKS.

MOSTLY, THE CONCERNS ARE WITH THE PROPOSED SYSTEM FOR ON-THE-AIR IDENTIFICATION. THE CALL SIGNS BEING PROPOSED WOULD NOT IN ALL CASES CONFORM TO THE ITU REGULATIONS; AN EVEN BIGGER PROBLEM, HOWEVER, IS THAT THEY WOULD BE SELF-ASSIGNED, WITH NO MEANS FOR LOCAL AMATEURS TO CHECK ON THE VALIDITY OF A SUSPICIOUS OPERATOR. IN ITS NOTICE, THE COMMISSION DOESN'T EVEN DISCUSS THE NEED FOR SAFEGUARDS AGAINST SUCH ABUSE. ALSO PUZZLING IS THAT THE COMMISSION DETERMINED JUST A FEW YEARS AGO THAT IT LACKED THE AUTHORITY TO IMPLEMENT A SIMILAR TEMPORARY-LICENSING PROPOSAL; THE BASIS FOR ITS NOW HAVING COME TO THE OPPOSITE CONCLUSION IS UNKNOWN, EVEN THOUGH THE LEAGUE RAISED THE POINT AT AN EARLIER STAGE IN THE PROCEEDING.

IF YOU ARE AMONG THE MANY WHO HAVE MISGIVINGS ABOUT THE PROPOSAL, REST ASSURED THAT THE ARRL BOARD SHARES YOUR CONCERNS. THE LEAGUE IS ON RECORD AS FAVORING AN EARLY IMPLEMENTATION OF ELECTRONIC FILING AS A BETTER WAY OF GETTING NEW AMATEURS ON THE AIR FASTER. WHETHER YOU AGREE OR NOT, FEEL FREE TO SHARE YOUR THOUGHTS BY WRITING YOUR ELECTED ARRL DIRECTOR; THEY HOLD THE OFFICE BECAUSE THEY'RE INTERESTED IN YOUR OPINION. YOU MAY ALSO WANT TO LET THE FCC KNOW WHAT YOU THINK. FRANKLY, BECAUSE THE COMMISSION WENT AHEAD AND PROPOSED SOMETHING WE'D ALREADY TOLD THEM WAS FLAWED, WE WOULDN'T MIND A BIT (AND IT MIGHT BE VERY USEFUL) IF YOU WOULD JUST TELL THEM YOU SUPPORT THE ARRL POSITION ON PR DOCKET 93-267, AND THAT THEY SHOULD GET MOVING ON ELECTRONIC FILING INSTEAD.

SEND AN ORIGINAL AND FOUR COPIES OF YOUR COMMENTS TO THE SECRETARY, FCC, WASHINGTON,DC, 20554. AT THE TOP PUT "IN THE MATTER OF PR DOCKET 93-267." MAKE SURE YOUR COMMENTS ARRIVE BY JANUARY 10,1994. WE AND YOUR DIRECTOR, WOULD BE PLEASED IF YOU'D FAVOR US WITH A COPY.- DAVID SUMMER, K1ZZ

===== END=====END=====

PARTS ONE (1) AND TWO (2) RETYPED FROM JANUARY 1994 QST. PAGE 9.

"IT SEEMS TO US..." COLUMN REGARDING INSTANT LICENSING.

=====

DECEMBER 27, 1993

MR. SUMNER;

I AM WRITING TO YOU IN REGARDS TO YOUR MOST RECENT EDITORIAL IN QST (JAN.94) ON "INSTANT LICENSING". IN THE FIRST PARAGRAPH YOU EXPLAINED THE JORRORS OF HAVING TO "ENDURE A PERIOD OF ANXIOUS, WATCHFUL WAITING AFTER TAKING THE EXAMINATION" AND HOW "FOR THE NEW ENTHUSIAST, IT CAN NEVER BE SOON ENOUGH."

YES, I CAN ENPATHIZE WITH THE NEW ENTHUSIAST, BUT WHY DOES YOUR EDITORIAL START IN A MOOD OF DOOM AND GLOOM ? WHY DO YOU FAIL TO POINT OUT THE POSTIVE ASPECTS OF HAVING TO WAIT REGARDLESS OF THE ACTUAL TIME, BE IT 12 WEEKS OR 6 WEEKS ?

AGAIN, IF YOUR REFERING TO THE NEW ENTHUSIAST BE IT THE NOVICE OR NO CODE TECH. THIS WOULD BE THE TIME WELL SPENT WITH HIS/HER ELMER, PREHAPS CONSTRUCTING YOUR HF STATION OR THE NEW NO CODER LISTENING AROUND ON THE LOCAL REPEATERS TO SEE "HOW IT'S DONE IN ROME". THIS TIME IS VERY CRITICAL IN MANY WAYS TO BETTER MANNERS AND OPERATING PRACTICES AND PROCEDURES, NOT TO MENTION TECHNOLOGICAL INVESTIGATIONS AND THE LIKE.

WHY DOES THE LEAGUE TAKE A DRAMATIC REVERSAL ON IT'S OPINION RELATED TO LICENSING WAIT TIMES, WHEN IN NOVEMBER 1988 ISSUE OF QST, ON PAGE 43 IN THE ARTICLE "NOVICE NOTES: BEFORE YOUR TICKET ARRIVES", THE OPINION STATED WAS "THE TIME BETWEEN THE NOVICE TEST AND THE ARRIVAL OF YOUR LICENSE CAN BE ONE OF THE MOST VALUABLE TIMES IN YOUR HAM CAREER, IF YOU USE IT WISELY." ? THE ARTICLE GOES ON TO SAY THE HAM IN-WAITING SHOULD DIRECT HIS OR HER EFFORTS TOWARDS CONTINUING THEIR LEARNING PROCESS, CONSTRUCTING THEIR SHACK, AND DECIDING ON WHAT TYPE OF ANTENNAS TO ERECT.

I CAN ALSO SYMPATHIZE WITH THE "LICENSING DELAYS TAKING 3 MONTHS" AS YOU STATED IN THE SECOND PARAGRAPH. ALL I CAN SAY IS THAT WE ALL HAD TO AT ONE TIME OR ANOTHER IN OUR LIVES 'WAIT FOR GOOD THINGS TO COME'. COULD YOU CONCEDE POSSIBLY THAT THE LICENSE ITSELF MAY CARRY MORE VALIDITY AFTER THE INITIAL PERIOD OF WAITING, STATION CONSTRUCTION, AND TRANSMISSION MONORTING?

I KNOW THAT MYSELF AND MANY OTHER HAMS HAD TOP WAIT OFTEN MORE THAN THE AVERAGE 6 WEEK PERIOD. ARE WE ANY WORST OFF TODAY ? I THINK NOT.

PARAGRAPHS 3 AND 4 I COULD ALMOST AGREE WITH, EXCEPT FOR A FEW MINOR POINTS.

YOU STATE THAT "YOU CAN'T BLAME THEM (THE NEW ENTHUSIAST) FOR WANTING TO KNOW" IN REGARDS TO CALLING THE VEC/FCC INQUIRING AS TO THE STATUS OF THEIR LICENSE, AND HOW THIS " PULLS PEOPLE AWAY FROM PROCESSING AND ADDS FURTHER TO THE BACK-LOG WHERE THE WORK TENDS TO BACK UP BECAUSE OF LIMITED STAFF AND AN OBSOLETE COMPUTER SYSTEM.

WHAT IS SO PREPLEXING TO ME IS THAT THERE ARE MANY WAYS TO REMEDY THIS PROBLEM, SUCH AS CUTTING THE VEC FILING DAYS FROM 10 TO 5, AND PREHAPS HAVE THE VEC MAIL A CARD TO LICENSE APPLICANT AT THE SAME TIME HIS/HER PAPER WORK IS MAILED TO THE FCC, THUS THE APPLICANT "KNOWS" THAT HIS/HER PAPER WORK HASN'T BEEN "LOST", AND IS JUST FLOUNDERING THRU THE NORMAL

US GOVERNMENT BUREAUCRATIC PROCESSING ENGINE.

I HAVE ALWAYS FOUND THE PROCESSING DELAYS TO BE WITH THE INEFFICIENT VEC SYSTEM, RATHER THAN THE FCC ITSELF. FOR INSTANCE, IN MAY 1993, A FRIENDS WIFE TOOK HER NOVICE EXAM ON MAY 21ST. AND HER PAPER WORK WAS MAILED TO THE FCC IN GETTYSBURG ON MAY 27TH. ON JUNE 23RD. SHE HAD HER LICENSE, PROCESSED AND DATED BY THE FCC IN MID-JUNE. A "TOTAL" PROCESSING TIME OF LESS THAN 4 WEEKS, FROM MAILBOX TO MAILBOX. SO, ONE YOU SPEAK OF 6 OR 12 WEEK DELAYS, OBVIOUSLY THEY ARE CAUSED BY AN INEFFICIENT VEC SYSTEM. PERHAPS THE LEAGUE SHOULD ATTEMPT TO REVAMP THE VEC SYSTEM SO THAT THE TURN-AROUND TIME IS BETTER.

EVEN IF THE BACK LOG IS AT THE FCC, ISN'T THE PROBLEM BETTER ADDRESSED BY HIRING AN ADDITIONAL STAFFER ? AND, AS YOU YOURSELF KNOW, PUT THE NEW COMPUTER SYSTEM THE FCC IS WORKING ON, ON LINE. IN FACT, IF THIS NEW COMPUTER SYSTEM IS GOING TO BE UP AND RUNNING THAN AS YOU STATE "THIS SHOULD RESULT IN TYPICAL TURN AROUND TIMES DROPPING TO JUST A COUPLE OF WEEKS- A DRAMATIC IMPROVMENT OVER PAST AND PRESENT PERFORMANCE" THEN I CAN'T EVEN UNDERSTAND WHY THE BIG CONCERN OVER HOW LONG IT TAKES FOR A TICKET TO ARRIVE.

I AM FAR MORE DISTURBED AND ALARMED AT THE NEXT FEW PARAGRAPHS WHERE YOU ACKNOWLEDGE THAT YOU ARE AWARE OF THE MAJORITY IN "THE HAM COMMUNITY THINKS THIS WOULD BE SUFFICIENT AND IS UNDERSTANDING THAT THE ADDITIONAL ADVANTAGES TO BE GAINED FROM INSTANT LICENSING OUTWEIGHS THE RISKS." HOWEVER, IN RETROSPECT, I CAN RECALL WHEN THE LEAGUE KNEW THAT THE MAJORITY OF MEMBERS DID NOT WANT THE NO CODE LICENSE PLAN (25 TO 1, ACCORDING TO "HAPPENINMGS: NO CODE REPLY COMMENTS , ARRL", QST, OCTOBER 1983, PG.58), AND THE LEAGUE TOOK A POSITION OF "NO CODE! NO WAY!"(QST, SEPTEMBER 1983, PG.61). NOW, FOR THE "BETTERMENT" OF THE HOBBY, WE HAVE A NO CODE LICENSE, SUPPORTED BY THE ARRL, IN DRASTIC CONTRAST TO WHAT IT'S OWN MEMBERS CLEARLY WANTED.

TOWARD THE END OF THE ARTICLE YOU STATED THAT THE FCC "IN IT'S NOTICE DOESN'T EVEN DISCUSS THE NEED FOR SAFEGUARDS AGAINST ABUSE". I WOULD SAY IF THE LEAGUE IS WELL AWARE OF THE "LACK OF SAFE GUARDS AGAINST ABUSE" AND MORE TO THE POINT, THE FACT THAT THE FCC "DOES'NT EVEN DISCUSS THE ISSUE OF SUCH SAFE GUARDS" THAT THIS IS THE PLACE TO START INSTEAD OF ASKING LEAGUE MEMBERS TO SUPPORT PR DOCKET 93-267(ASKING THE FCC"TO GET MOVING ON ELECTRONIC FILING"). LET'S NOT PUT THE CART (ELECTRONIC FILING) BEFORE THE HORSE (ENFORCEMENT) AND STOP WORRYING ABOUT HOW FAST SOME ONE CAN BE GRADIFIED

WITH AN INSTANT OR "QUICKY" LICENSE, BUT RATHER WITH THE PRESERVATION OF THE REPUTATION OF THE AMATEUR SERVICE.

LAST BUT NOT LEAST I WOULD LIKE A LOT MORE ASSURANCE ON THIS ISSUE THAN "REST ASSURED THAT THE ARRL BOARD SHARES YOUR CONCERNS". GIVEN THE TRACK RECORD AND 180 DEGREES TURNAROUND ON THE ISSUE OF THE NO CODE LICENSE FROM YOUR OWN EDITORIAL "NO TIME FOR NO CODE" (QST,NOVEMBER 1982,PG.9) TO "CODLESS LICENSE...THE TIME HAS COME" (QST,SEPTEMBER 1989,PG9) THAT YOU ALSO PENNED, I THINK A MORE DEFINITIVE STATMENT FROM THE LEAGUE SHOULD BE FORTH COMING.

DON'T MISUNDERSTAND ME, I AM GLAD THE LEAGUE IS IN FAVOR OF ELECTRONIC FILING. THAT'S FINE, BUT THE LEAGUE NEEDS TO UNEQUIVOCALLY STATE IN PRINT THAT IT IS *****NOT***** IN FAVOR OF ANY INSTANT LICENSING PLAN. WE HAVE WITNESSED WHAT THE NO CODE HAS DONE FOR THE HOBBY AS WELL AS TO THE NOVICE AND ELMER PART OF THE LICENSING STRUCTURE. LET'S NOT OPEN A PANDORA'S BOX OF PROBLEMS WITH INSTANT LICENSING.

SINCERELY,
FRANK ALMEIDA III/ WR1R

P.S.: BY THE WAY I FIND IT IRONIC THAT YOUR ARTICLE SPEAKS ABOUT INSTANT LICENSING AND ON PG.52 OF JANUARY 94 QST. IN THE ARTICLE "WHERE ARE THE NOVICES" I QUOTE "THE JULY 1993 EDITORIAL ARRL EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT DAVE SUMNER, K1ZZ, OPENED A CAN OF WORMS BY PENNING "WHERE ARE THE NOVICES?"

I CAN TELL YOU WHERE THEY WENT.....THEY FOLLOWED THEIR ELMER.....AND GOT ON THE.....NO CODE EXPRESS....73'S

Date: 3 Jan 94 13:16:08 GMT
From: ogicse!emory!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <2g7eua\$epl@reznor.larc.nasa.gov>, <2g7p56\$9s9@crl2.crl.com>,
<1994Jan2.212541.3319@cmkrrn1>
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: why 29.94 fps?

In article <1994Jan2.212541.3319@cmkrrn1> jeh@cmkrrn1.com (Jamie Hanrahan, Kernel Mode Systems) writes:

>In article <2g7p56\$9s9@crl2.crl.com>, lreeves@crl.com (Les Reeves) writes:

>> The colorburst frequency is not only cast in stone-it is extremely accurate.

>> It is more accurate as a frequency reference than WWV. This is provided
>> that you are tuned to a network-supplied program.

>

>Is this still true?

No, and it never was except in some very special cases. Because of the way the terrestrial telco microwave distribution was done, the reference phase changed during the course of the day.

>I have no direct knowledge, but... many years ago (mid-70's if I remember
>right) one of the hobby electronics mags (I think it was Radio-Electronics) had
>an article for a frequency standard derived from a color tv. Soon afterward a
>letter appeared in the letter column (where else :-), written by an engineer at
>one of the better-equipped stations in L.A. He stated that even network-
>supplied programs taken from a live feed usually go through a time-base
>corrector at the local station, and that this breaks the "chain of
>traceability" back to the network's precision frequency standard.

That's correct, though the device is actually called a frame synchronizer. The broadcast subcarrier is referenced to the station master sync generator, and that's usually a simple crystal controlled oscillator. The FCC tolerance on subcarrier is +/- 10 Hz so a crystal reference is good enough.

>(of course, anything that the local taped from a satellite feed for broadcast
>later is completely divorced from any standards at the network.)

>

>Also, at that time it was stated that the networks used rubidium-clock
>frequency standards, which are secondary standards: They're awfully good but
>they still have to be calibrated against something better. NIST (the folks who
>run WWV) uses cesium-beam clocks, which are primary standards, needing no
>calibration for frequency. Have the networks since upgraded to cesium-beam
>clocks? And, given that the local stations probably haven't, does it matter
>anyway? Even if they have, they're still "only" as good as NIST's clocks, so
>why should one over-the-air signal be better than another? (propagation
>changes on shortwave, maybe?)

The networks have abandoned the rubidium references and use crystal oscillators today, just like the local stations. With the change from telco microwave distribution to satellite distribution, there is enough doppler that a tight reference is worthless anyway. Geosync satellites really aren't precisely geosync. They describe small figure 8s in their position boxes, and this introduces enough phase variation through path length changes, and enough frequency error through doppler, that you can watch the subcarrier vector rotate one way then the other if you reference the vectorscope to the uplink signal while watching the downlink signal. There's a several Hertz +/- error that varies over the course of the day.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: (null)

From: (null)

Interesting. I received a one-page sheet from them in July 1993 that sounds very similar to what you describe. Except they specifically talk about an output power of 100 watts and no mention is made about having the work done by an authorized Toyota service facility. It also said that the "10 watts maximum power" limitation will be removed from the 1994 Toyota repair manuals.

Here's what it said about the new vehicle warranty:

"It must be emphasized that, under the terms of Toyota's new vehicle warranty, any damage caused by RF energy from a higher power mobile radio is specifically excluded from coverage because it is not the result of faulty materials or workmanship. Accordingly, all such responsibility is assumed by the owner."

Since they specifically mentioned 100 watts in a previous bullet item, I assume by "higher power mobile radio" they mean higher than 100 watts. I hope this is not a bad assumption.

73,

Bob K2PH

--

Bob Schreibmaier K2PH		UUCP:	...	att!mtdcr!bob
AT&T Bell Laboratories		Internet:	bob@mtdcr.att.com	
Middletown, N.J. 07748		ICBM:	40o21'N, 74o8'W	

End of Info-Hams Digest V93 #1539
